

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. In the final Office Action of August 23, 2007, all claims were rejected. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 11-17 and 21, have amended claims 2-4, 6-10 and 18-20 and respond and traverse the rejections as follows.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner admit the proposed amendment because it will place the application in condition for allowance.

### General Comments Regarding Amendments

By the proposed claim amendments, Applicants have amended all of the independent claims to include certain features regarding a confirmation code. Specifically, the features include “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code.” Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at [0037-38]. None of the references of record teach or disclose these features.

### Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

#### *Claims 1-5, 10, 11 and 16-21*

Claims 1-5, 10, 11 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis, Jr. (Paper #20051130, US 2001/0037230, which incorporates in its entirety Raveis, Jr., US Patent Application 09/459,234, now US Patent 6,321,202) in view of Gilgoff (PTO-892, Item U) (hereinafter “Gilgoff”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of them.

Applicants have canceled claims 1, 11, 16, 17 and 21 without prejudice.

For the reasons set forth in Applicants’ previous responses, Applicants submit that Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff should not be combined for purposes of section 103. Without prejudice to Applicants’ position, however, Applicants have amended claims 2-4, 10 and 18-20. Applicants respectfully submit that, even if it were proper to combine Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, that combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of these amended claims.

Claim 2 is directed to a method of providing, via a computer network marketplace, auxiliary services or goods relating to an originating transaction between a customer and a host. The method includes: processing an originating transaction by accepting customer input requested by a host; enabling a customer in the computer network marketplace to access content regarding an auxiliary service or good relating to the originating transaction; processing a secondary transaction for the auxiliary service or good between the customer and a vendor listed in the marketplace; and accepting a payment from the customer for the service or good. Claim 2 has been amended to add “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code.”<sup>1</sup>

Applicants respectfully submit that Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 2. At the very least, they do not teach or suggest “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code” as recited in the claim. Indeed, nothing in the cited references suggests anything about a confirmation code. Applicants submit, therefore, that claim 2 is patentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, taken alone or in combination.

Each of independent claims 3 and 4 is directed to a method of providing, via a computer network marketplace, auxiliary services or goods relating to moving or relocating. Each of these claims also has been amended to recite the features of “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code.”<sup>2</sup> For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, taken alone or in combination.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants also have made other amendments to claim 2 so that the claim reads better and/or to broaden the claim, which amendments do not narrow the scope of the claim.

<sup>2</sup> Applicants also have made other amendments to claims 3 and 4 so that the claims read better and/or to broaden the claims, which amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Each of claims 5 and 10 depends from and includes all of the features of claim 4. Applicants therefore submit, at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4, that Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff also do not render claims 5 and 10 obvious.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a method of providing, via a computer network marketplace, a first service or good relating to a second service or good. Independent claim 19 is directed to a method of providing a service or good relating to moving using a computer network marketplace, wherein the service is offered upon completion of an originating transaction between a customer and a marketplace. Each of claims 18 and 19 also has been amended to recite the features of “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code.”<sup>3</sup>

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of amended claims 18 or 19. At the very least, as discussed above, the cited references do not teach or suggest “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code” as recited in each of the claims. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 18 and 19 are patentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer system for providing auxiliary services in an online marketplace relating to an originating transaction between a customer and a host. The system comprises one or more processors and a computer readable memory accessible by the one or more processors. The computer readable memory contains programming instructions for: processing an originating transaction by accepting customer input requested by a host; enabling a customer in the marketplace to access content describing an auxiliary service or good relating to the originating transaction; processing a secondary transaction for the auxiliary service or good between the customer and a vendor.

---

<sup>3</sup> Applicants also have made other amendments to claims 18 and 19 so that the claims read better and/or to broaden the claims, which amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Claim 20 has been amended to further recite that the computer readable memory contains programming instructions for: “accepting a customer payment for the service or good; issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of amended claim 20. At the very least, as discussed above, the cited references do not teach or suggest “issuing to the customer a confirmation code associated with the secondary transaction; and after performance of the service or delivery of the good, activating a payment for the service or good in response to the vendor entering the confirmation code” as recited in the claim. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff, taken alone or in combination.

*Claims 6-8 and 14*

Claims 6-8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff as applied to claims 4 and 11, and further in view of Diehl (Item V, PTO-892). Applicants traverse and request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

For the reasons set forth in Applicants’ previous responses, Applicants respectfully submit that Raveis, Jr., Gilgoff and Diehl should not be combined for purposes of section 103. Even if it were proper to combine those references, however, that combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 6-8.

Each of claims 6-8 depends from and includes all of the limitations of claim 4. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4, the combination of Raveis, Jr., Gilgoff and Diehl does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in Applicants’ claims 6-8 and does not render those claims obvious.

Applicants have canceled claim 14 without prejudice.

*Claim 9*

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Meno (Item W, PTO-892). Applicants traverse and request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

For the reasons set forth in Applicants' previous responses, Applicants respectfully submit that Raveis, Jr., Gilgoff and Meno should not be combined for purposes of section 103. In any event, Applicants respectfully submit that Raveis, Jr., Gilgoff and Meno, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 9.

Claim 9 depends from and includes all of the limitations of claim 4. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the claim 4, the combination of Raveis, Jr., Gilgoff and Meno also does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in Applicants' claim 9 and does not render that claim obvious.

*Claim 15*

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis, Jr. and Gilgoff as applied to claim 4, and further in view of the Examiner's Official Notice that it is well known to accept information from an external source when processing customer applications.

Applicants have canceled claim 15 without prejudice.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal

communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: September 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard E. Oney/  
Richard E. Oney  
Registration No. 36,884  
Tiffany & Bosco, P.A.  
2525 E. Camelback Road, Third Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
Tel: (602) 255-6094